



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/218,143	12/22/1998	JEAN-LUC IMLER	029395-005	3481

21839 7590 07/06/2005

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC  
(INCLUDING BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS)  
POST OFFICE BOX 1404  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

PRIEBE, SCOTT DAVID

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1633

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/218,143	<b>Applicant(s)</b> IMLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Scott D. Priebe, Ph.D.	<b>Art Unit</b> 1633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 56,57,59 and 61-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 56,57,59 and 61-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20050526</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 1633

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The Group and/or Art Unit designation of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Primary Examiner Scott D. Priebe, Ph.D., Group Art Unit 1633.

#### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement filed 5/26/05 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein as Sussenbach has not been considered.

Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).

#### ***Interference***

Interference Nos. 104,820; 104,822; 104,823; and 105,046 have been terminated by decisions favorable to applicant. Interference Nos. 104,821 and 105,136 have been terminated by decisions adverse-in-part to applicant. *Ex parte* prosecution is resumed.

Art Unit: 1633

Claims 56, 57, 59, and 61-65, as to which a judgment adverse to Applicant has been rendered in the '821 interference, stand finally disposed of in accordance with 37 CFR 41.127. It is suggested that these claims be cancelled.

Only new claims 66 and 67 are treated on the merits.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 66 and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Gregory et al., 5,670,488.

The instant claims require a replication defective adenovirus whose genome lacks part of the E1A or E1B regions or both and part of the E4 region or lacks function of at least one E1 gene and at least one E4 gene. The claims do not require that the replication defect be due to both

Art Unit: 1633

the deletions in both E1 and E4. A deletion in either of E1A or in E4 that encompassed both E4 ORFs 3 and 6 would render the vector replication defective. Consequently, the claims embrace an embodiment wherein the E1 region is deleted and wherein some E4 ORFs are deleted, but not both ORF3 and ORF6. Such an adenoviral vector is the subject of claim 3 of the '488 patent.

This rejection would be overcome by amending the claims to unequivocally indicate that the deletion in either E1 or E4 alone cause the vector to be replication defective, i.e. the vector is doubly defective for replication, or that complementation of both the E1 and E4 deletions *in trans* is required for preparing the adenovirus.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1633

Claims 66 and 67 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berkner (Curr. Top. Microbiol. Immunol. 158: 39-66, 1992) in view of Bridge et al. (Virology 174: 345-353, 1990) as required by the Board in Paper No. 62 of Interference No. 105136 at page 20 for the reasons set forth by the Board in pages 17-19.

This rejection would be overcome by amending the claims to unequivocally indicate that the deletion in either E1 or E4 alone cause the vector to be replication defective, i.e. the vector is doubly defective for replication, or that complementation of both the E1 and E4 deletions *in trans* is required for preparing the adenovirus.

### ***Double Patenting***

The terminal disclaimers filed on 4/12/01 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration dates of US Pat. No. 6,040,174 and any patent issuing from U.S. application 09/739,007 (which has been allowed) have been reviewed and accepted. The terminal disclaimers have been recorded.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 66-67 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3, 6-8, 18, 20, 21, and 24-26 of U.S. Patent No. 6,133,028. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because invention of the '028 patent is explicitly directed to cells and methods of using same for production of the adenovirus of the instant invention that lacks an E1A, E1B and E4 gene products. It is noted that the subject matter claimed in the instant application had been examined in the parent application 08/379,452 (now 6,040,174) before cancellation of this subject matter in the '452 application.

Claims 66-67 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 81 and 85 of copending Application No. 09/725,720. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the '720 application are directed to stocks of adenovirus that are embraced by the instant claims.


This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented. However, the '720 application has been allowed, and upon issuance as a patent, this rejection will no longer be provisional.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott D. Priebe, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-0733. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-0731. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1633

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Scott D. Priebe". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Scott D. Priebe, Ph.D.  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1633